

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated August 21, 2008. Claims 16-19 and 23-25 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. By virtue of this amendment, claims 3-13, and 21-22 are pending.

Applicants are not conceding in this application that cancelled claims 16-19 and 23-25 are not patentable over any prior art, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the cancelled and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. It is submitted that the present response places the application in condition for allowance or, at least, presents the application in better form for another appeal. Entry of the present response is therefore respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- Rejected claims 3, 7-11, 13, 16, 21, 23, 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), in further view of Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and in further view of Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678);
- Rejected claims 4-6 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678), and in further view of Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022); and
- Rejected claims 12, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678), and in further view of Lawrence (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,342).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Meyerzon, Tuli, and Koike

As noted above, the Examiner claims 3, 7-11, 13, 16, 21, 23, 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), in further view of Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and in further view of Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678).

Applicants have cancelled claims 16, 23, and 25, thereby rendering this rejection of claims 16, 23, and 25 moot.

Meyerzon discloses a mechanism for obtaining information pertaining to electronic documents that reside on one or more server computers. In particular, Meyerzon teaches a web crawler program including a gatherer process for gathering information pertaining to electronic documents. See Meyerzon at col. 8, lines 58-60. In the system of Meyerzon, worker threads process URLs and then pass each URL to a filter daemon. See Meyerzon at col. 9, lines 13-16. The filter daemon uses the URL to retrieve the electronic document at the address specified by the URL. See Meyerzon at col. 9, lines 16-20. After retrieving an electronic document, the filter daemon parses the electronic document and returns a list of text and properties. See Meyerzon at col. 9, lines 29-31. The worker thread then passes the list of properties and text to the indexing engine for creating an index which is used by the search engine in subsequent searches. See Meyerzon at col. 10, lines 13-16. A user may then examine the list of documents returned by the search engine, select a document, and then the web browser displays the selected document to the user. See Meyerzon at col. 8, lines 23-25 and 32-35.

(A) Applicants would like to first address the Examiner's remarks in the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action. The Examiner first states that:

The applicant's initial argument with respect to Meyerzon is based upon the applicant's belief that Meyerzon fails to disclose "a web-browser at the server as part of the web crawler (page 1)." The applicant further states, "the web-crawler claimed in the present invention isn't merely acting as a web-browser but rather a separate web browser is being executed as part of the web crawler (page 1)." The

examiner disagrees with this assertion. The applicant's claim clearly states, "executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web-crawler (claim 21, lines 5)." Contrary to the applicant's argument, the web browser is not separate from the web crawler; in fact, the web browser is a portion of the web crawler. Although, the applicant claims, "retrieving, to the server, with a web crawler from a network address, a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein (claim 21, lines 2-3)," this limitation does not restrict the browser, being executed as part of the web crawler, from retrieving the dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein. Meyerzon discloses a web-crawler, having a web-browser as part of the web-crawler, which retrieves a document to the server (Figure 2), and executing at the server the web browser to render in memory copy of the retrieved document (column 7, line 60- column 8, line 20; BPAI Decision of 22 August 2007: page 6). For these reasons, this argument is not persuasive.

The Examiner is apparently not giving any weight to the claim language "executing, at the server, a web-browser..." because the presently claimed invention recites "as part of the web crawler" and Meyerzon teaches a web crawler. However, the Examiner must give proper weight to the "executing, at the server, a web-browser..." claim element and show where Meyerzon teaches "executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web crawler". The Examiner first states on page 4 of the present Office Action that the "crawler acts as a web browser in that it requests the web page data". Then the Examiner states in the Response to Arguments section that "Meyerzon discloses a web-crawler, having a web-browser as part of the web-crawler, which retrieves a document to the server (Figure 2)". These two statements made by the Examiner contradict each other. The first assertion infers that the crawler of Meyerzon does not have a web browser but acts like one since it retrieves web page data. However, this is what a web crawler does - it retrieves web page data. A browser renders a web page. The second assertion then states that the crawler does have a browser. However, this is incorrect. FIG. 2 of Meyerzon only shows a browser at the client system, not at the server. In fact, nowhere does Meyerzon teach or suggest that the crawler has a browser and especially does not teach that a browser is executed as part of the web crawler.

The Examiner's statement of "Meyerzon discloses a web-crawler, having a web-browser as part of the web-crawler, which retrieves a document to the server (Figure 2), and executing at the server the web browser to render in memory copy of the retrieved document (column 7, line 60-column 8, line 20; BPAI Decision of 22 August 2007; page 6)" shows how the Examiner is mischaracterizing Meyerzon. Col. 7, line 60-col. 8, line 20 of Meyerzon merely states:

The Web crawler program 206 searches remote server computers 218 connected to the network 216 for electronic documents 222 and 224. The Web crawler 206 retrieves electronic documents and associated data. The contents of the electronic documents 222 and 224, along with the associated data, can be used in a variety of ways. For example, the Web crawler 206 may pass the information to an indexing engine 208. An indexing engine 208 is a computer program that maintains an index 210 of electronic documents. The index 210 is similar to the index in a book, and contains reference information and pointers to corresponding electronic documents to which the reference information applies. For example, the index may include keywords, and for each keyword a list of addresses. Each address can be used to locate a document that includes the keyword. The index may also include information other than keywords used within the electronic documents. For example, the index 210 may include subject headings or category names, even when the literal subject heading or category name is not included within the electronic document. The type of information stored in the index depends upon the complexity of the indexing engine, which may analyze the contents of the electronic document and store the results of the analysis.

A client computer 214, such as the personal computer 20 (FIG. 1), is connected to the server computer 204 by a computer network 212. The computer network 212 may be a local area network, a wide area network, or a combination of networks.


As can be seen, Meyerzon merely teaches that electronic documents and associated data are retrieved and can then be indexed. Nowhere does Meyerzon teach or suggest that a web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the dynamic document which has been retrieved. In fact, the indexing taught by Meyerzon is not even performed by the web-crawler. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide clarification as to how indexing electronic documents and associated data as taught by Meyerzon is the same as a web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the dynamic document which has been retrieved as taught by the presently claimed invention.

The Examiner further states in the Response to Argument section that:

The applicant further argues that Meyerzon fails to teach a web browser "displays an in-memory copy of the data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the data document maintains a web-browser display format and a web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when displayed in a web browser (page 2)." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Meyerzon discloses the rendering for display of the retrieved document (column 7, line 6-column 8, line 20). Further, "upon retrieval of a web page document by Meyerzon's web crawler 206, a filter 314 parses the document and returns text and properties to be included in the in-memory data structure of the web crawler. The text information is information which is to be displayed for viewing at an end-user's web browser as claimed as indicated by Meyerzon's disclosure (col. 9,11. 34-36) that such stored information includes text formatting data (BPAI Decision of 22 August 2007: page 6)." Therefore, Meyerzon discloses rendering an in memory copy of the data, including display format, layout, and content data. For these reasons, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

The Examiner is asserting that because Meyerzon teaches a filter that parses a document and returns text and properties, Meyerzon teaches "wherein the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document maintains a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when the web-browser renders the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document". However, the Examiner has failed to notice that Meyerzon only teaches that the filter merely returns a list of text and properties such as the formatting of the text and that this list is passed to an indexing engine. Stated differently, nowhere does Meyerzon teach or suggest an in-memory copy of a dynamic data document that "maintains a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when the web-browser renders the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document". At best, Meyerzon only stores a list of text and properties, which in no way are a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of a document. In fact, Meyerzon never teaches rendering a document. The fact that Meyerzon teaches that "[t]he information may be text that is to be displayed in the Web browser program" is irrelevant since Meyerzon only teaches that the web crawler uses a filter to return a list of this text and properties associated therewith.

The following diagrams illustrate at least some of the differences between the presently claimed invention and Meyerzon:



As can be seen from the above illustrations, the presently claimed invention and Meyerzon are completely different. Meyerzon only maintains a list of text and properties associated with a document in memory, whereas the presently claimed invention renders a dynamic data document and maintains an in-memory copy of the rendered document. Meyerzon never renders the document that the crawler retrieves. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon for at least these reasons.

- (B) In the present Office Action, the Examiner states on page 4 that Meyerzon teaches: retrieving, to a server, with a web crawler from a network address, a data document with client-side scripting code therein (Figure 2: Here, a web crawler server is implemented between a client and a web server)

The Examiner merely repeats the previous rejection of this claim element and support thereof. As pointed out in the previous Response, Meyerzon does not teach or suggest a data document

with client-side scripting code therein. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide clarification as to how FIG. 2 of Meyerzon with “a web crawler server is implemented between a client and a web server” teaches or suggests the presently claimed “retrieving, to a server, with a web crawler from a network address, a data document with client-side scripting code therein”. Meyerzon is completely silent on this claim element. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon for at least this reason.

(C) The Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action also states that Meyerzon teaches:

Executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web crawler, wherein the web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the data document maintains a web-browser display format and a web-browser display layout of the data document when displayed in the web browser (Meyerzon Col 7 Lines 60-65 and Col 8 Lines 15-20: Here, the crawler acts as a web browser in that it requests the web page data. These requested web page documents are stored in memory in a display format)

The remarks and arguments present above in section (A) are applicable here and will not be repeated.

Applicants would like to first point out that Meyerzon only teaches a web crawler that crawls web pages in a traditional matter. Meyerzon further adds a method for only retrieving web pages that have changed from previous crawls. The web crawler of Meyerzon is unable to crawl and properly summarize dynamic data documents that include client-side scripting code.

Col. 7, lines 60-65 and col. 8, lines 15-20 of Meyerzon merely stated that a web crawler retrieves electronic documents and associated data. Reading this teaching as “wherein the web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the data document maintains a web-browser display format and a web-browser display layout of the data document when displayed in the web browser” is improperly broadening the scope of Meyerzon. Retrieving electronic documents is not the same as

rendering an “in-memory copy of the data document maintains a web-browser display format and a web-browser display layout of the data document when displayed in the web browser”. As discussed above, Meyerzon, at best, only stores a list of text and its properties.

As has been thoroughly discussed in previous Responses, Meyerzon explicitly states that text and properties are obtained from tags within the HTML documents. See Meyerzon at column 9, lines 9-43. Therefore, Meyerzon is working on HTML source code, as compared to a “render[ed] in-memory copy of the dynamic data document which has been retrieved”. In other words, Meyerzon is working on the source HTML code, whereas the presently claimed invention is working on content after the source code is rendered by a web-browser.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon for at least these reasons as well.

(D) The Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action also states that Meyerzon teaches:

Executing, at the server instead of a client system, a browser scripting engine as part of the web-browser for loading content as directed by the client-side scripting code into the in-memory copy creating a final web-browser display representation of the dynamic data document so that the final web-browser display representation is substantially similar to when the data document is viewed by a user in the user's web- browser running on the client system when all the data is viewed (Meyerzon Col 7 Lines 60-65 and Col 8 Lines 15-20)

Col. 7, lines 60-65 and col. 8, lines 15-20 of Meyerzon merely state:

The Web crawler program 206 searches remote server computers 218 connected to the network 216 for electronic documents 222 and 224. The Web crawler 206 retrieves electronic documents and associated data. The contents of the electronic documents 222 and 224, along with the associated data, can be used in a variety of ways....The type of information stored in the index depends upon the complexity of the indexing engine, which may analyze the contents of the electronic document and store the results of the analysis.

A client computer 214, such as the personal computer 20 (FIG. 1), is connected to the server computer 204 by a computer network 212...

Applicants in the previous Response requested that the Examiner point out in the above teachings of Meyerzon where Meyerzon teaches the above claim elements. The Examiner did not provide any further clarification in the present Office Action. The Examiner merely repeated his previous rejection. **Therefore, Applicants once again respectfully request that the Examiner provide clarification** as to how Meyerzon's teaching of "Web crawler 206 retrieves electronic documents and associated data. The contents of the electronic documents 222 and 224, along with the associated data" is the same as "executing, at the server instead of a client system, a browser scripting engine as part of the web-browser, wherein the browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code and loads content as directed by the client-side scripting code into the in-memory copy creating a final web-browser display representation of the dynamic data document so that the final web-browser display representation is substantially similar to when the dynamic data document is rendered at a user's web-browser and viewed by a user in the user's web-browser running on the client system when all the dynamic data is viewed".

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is erroneously using hindsight. Recently the Supreme Court in *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, 2007 WL 1237837, at 17 (2007) stated "*The Court of Appeals, finally, drew the wrong conclusion from the risk of courts and patent examiners falling prey to hindsight bias. A fact finder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon ex post reasoning. See Graham, 383 U. S., at 36 (warning against a "temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue" and instructing courts to "guard against slipping into the use of hindsight"*" (quoting *Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.*, 332 F. 2d 406, 412 (CA6 1964))). Here, the Applicant's respectfully submit that the Examiner is not only ignoring material limitations, but that the Examiner has not provided the required articulated reasoning to establish *prima facie* obviousness under KSR and its progeny.

One advantage of the presently claimed invention is that executable code can be executed by the web-browser that is part of the web crawler. The ability of the web crawler to create a rendered in-memory copy of the dynamic data document and executing client-side scripting code to load additional content into the in-memory copy enhances existing document gathering and analysis by, for example, dramatically improving the quality of the extracted metadata. This is due to the fact that the summarization of a document is based on the whole and complete document as it was designed by the document's author; the static heterogeneous data as well as the problematic dynamic data is completely rendered and integrated into the metadata for subsequent indexing of all metadata by a web crawler. For example, a dynamic in-memory representation of the web page, as intended to be seen by an end user, is created to extract the most accurate and comprehensive data set possible. A standard web crawler, as taught by Meyerzon, is not able to compose this type of highly dynamic and distributed document that includes dynamic information such as client side script, applets, or their equivalents.

As has been previously argued, Meyerzon does not even mention client-side scripting code. This is because the only items that are extracted from a retrieved document in Meyerzon is text and properties associated with the text. The Examiner compares Meyerzon's teaching of returning a list of text and its properties to the presently claimed rendering of an in-memory copy of a dynamic data document (which, as discussed above, is an incorrect comparison and a mischaracterization of Meyerzon). However, not only does the presently claimed invention rendering an in-memory copy of a dynamic data document, client-side scripting code is executed to load content as directed by the code into the in-memory copy. In other words, the in-memory copy already exists and additional content is loaded based on executed client-side scripting code. Therefore, assuming arguendo that the Examiner's comparison of Meyerzon's list of text and properties is the same as the rendered in-memory copy (which it is not), then Meyerzon must teach content, as directed by client-side scripting code that is being executed, is then loaded into this list of text and properties. Nowhere does Meyerzon teach or suggest this.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon for at least these reasons as well.

(E) The Examiner on pages 4-5 of the Office Action also states that Meyerzon teaches:

Indexing, at the server, the content in the memory, wherein the content being indexed is the content which has been loaded by the browser scripting engine in order to index the data document as if being viewed by the user in the user's web-browser on the client system (Figures 4-5).

Meyerzon only teaches that the list of text and properties is index. Nowhere does Meyerzon teach or suggest indexing of “content which has been loaded by the browser scripting engine in order to index the data document as if being viewed by the user in the user's web-browser on the client system”. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon for at least these reasons as well.

(F) The Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action correctly states that:

Meyerzon does not specifically mention wherein the server processing unit renders the in-memory webpage prior to analyzing and summarizing the in-memory webpage.

However, the Examiner goes on to combine Meyerzon with Tuli stating:

Tuli discloses rendering the webpage at a server prior to analyzing and summarizing the webpage (column 5, lines 39-50; Here, a webpage is received at a server from a remote device. Upon receipt, the entire webpage document is rendered. After this rendering the page is divided, compressed, and transmitted to a device remote to the server). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to apply Tuli to Meyerzon, providing Meyerzon the benefit of rendering the document prior analyzing, thereby ensuring appropriate analysis of the document.

Applicants respectfully point out that independent claim 1 **does not** recite “wherein the server processing unit renders the in-memory webpage prior to analyzing and summarizing the in-memory webpage”.

Even so, Meyerzon and Tuli either alone and/or in combination with each other do not teach or suggest:

retrieving, to a server, with a web crawler from a network address, a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein;

executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web crawler, wherein the web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the dynamic data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document maintains a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when the web-browser renders the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document;

executing, at the server instead of a client system, a browser scripting engine as part of the web-browser, wherein the browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code and loads content as directed by the client-side scripting code into the in-memory copy creating a final web-browser display representation of the dynamic data document so that the final web-browser display representation is substantially similar to when the dynamic data document is rendered at a user's web-browser and viewed by a user in the user's web-browser running on the client system when all the dynamic data is viewed; and

indexing, at the server, the content in the memory, wherein the content being indexed is the content which has been loaded by the browser scripting engine in order to index the dynamic data document as if being viewed by the user in the user's web-browser on the client system.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon and Tuli alone and/or in combination with one another.

(G) The Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action correctly states that:

Meyerzon does not specifically disclose wherein the data document is a dynamic data document, wherein an in-memory copy of a dynamic data document is rendered, and wherein a browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code.

However, the Examiner goes on to combine Meyerzon with Koike stating that Koike discloses:

a proxy server assembling a dynamic data document for display at a client browser wherein an in-memory copy of a dynamic data document is rendered, and wherein a browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code (Figures 6-8; column 7, lines 13-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Koike with Meyerzon, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly receive the dynamic data.

As discussed in the previous Response, Koike only discloses “dynamically generating a customized WWW page according to user information and or requests”. See Koike at col. 6, lines 39-41. This is clearly not the same as “a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein”. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide clarification as to how Koike’s teaching of “dynamically generating a customized WWW page according to user information and or requests” is the same as the presently claimed “a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein”. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention distinguishes over Meyerzon, Tuli, and Koike alone and/or in combination with one another.

For the foregoing reasons, independent claim 21 distinguishes over Meyerzon, Tuli, and Koike taken alone and/or in combination with each other. Claims 3, 7-11, and 13 depend from claim 21 either directly or by way of an intervening claim. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 3, 7-11, and 13 distinguish over Meyerzon taken alone and/or in view of Tuli and/or in view of Koike, as well, and the Examiner’s rejection should be withdrawn, which withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Hobbs

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678), and in further view of Hobbs (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022).

Applicants have cancelled claims 17-19, thereby rendering this rejection of claims 17-19 moot.

The remarks and arguments above made with respect to independent claim 21 are also applicable here and will not be repeated.

Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Hobbs alone and/or in combination with each other do not teach or suggest:

retrieving, to a server, with a web crawler from a network address, a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein;

executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web crawler, wherein the web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the dynamic data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document maintains a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when the web-browser renders the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document;

executing, at the server instead of a client system, a browser scripting engine as part of the web-browser, wherein the browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code and loads content as directed by the client-side scripting code into the in-memory copy creating a final web-browser display representation of the dynamic data document so that the final web-browser display representation is substantially similar to when the dynamic data document is rendered at a user's web-browser and viewed by a user in the user's web-browser running on the client system when all the dynamic data is viewed; and

indexing, at the server, the content in the memory, wherein the content being indexed is the content which has been loaded by the browser scripting engine in order to index the dynamic data document as if being viewed by the user in the user's web-browser on the client system.

Accordingly, the presently claimed invention and particularly independent claim 21 and its dependent claims 4-6 and distinguish over Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Hobbs, either alone or in combination with one another, for at least these reasons and the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn, which withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Lawrence

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,638,314), Tuli (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,009), and Koike et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,194,678), and in further view of Lawrence (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,342).

The remarks and arguments above made with respect to independent claim 21 are also applicable here and will not be repeated.

Applicants have cancelled claim 24, thereby rendering this rejection of claim 24 moot.

Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Lawrence alone and/or in combination with each other do not teach or suggest:

- retrieving, to a server, with a web crawler from a network address, a dynamic data document with client-side scripting code therein;

- executing, at the server, a web-browser, as part of the web crawler, wherein the web-browser renders an in-memory copy of the dynamic data document which has been retrieved, wherein the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document maintains a rendered web-browser display format and a rendered web-browser display layout of the dynamic data document when the web-browser renders the in-memory copy of the dynamic data document;

- executing, at the server instead of a client system, a browser scripting engine as part of the web-browser, wherein the browser scripting engine executes the client-side scripting code and loads content as directed by the client-side scripting code into the in-memory copy creating a final web-browser display representation of the dynamic data document so that the final web-browser display representation is substantially similar to when the dynamic data document is rendered at a user's web-browser and viewed by a user in the user's web-

browser running on the client system when all the dynamic data is viewed; and indexing, at the server, the content in the memory, wherein the content being indexed is the content which has been loaded by the browser scripting engine in order to index the dynamic data document as if being viewed by the user in the user's web-browser on the client system.

Accordingly, independent claim 21 and its dependent claims 12 and 22 distinguish over Meyerzon, Tuli, Koike, and Lawrence alone and/or in combination with one another, and the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn, which withdrawal is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to the disclosure of information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment is limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and their attorneys.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the grounds for rejection stated in the Examiner's Office Action have been overcome, and that all claims in the application are allowable. No new matter has been added. It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to share any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 09-0441. In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and re-examination is requested.

PLEASE, if for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (561) 989-9811 should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 2, 2008

By: / Jon Gibbons/
Jon Gibbons
Registration No. 37,333
Attorney for Applicants

FLEIT, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN, BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
One Boca Commerce Center, Suite 111
551 Northwest 77th Street
Boca Raton, FL 33487
Tel. (561) 989-9811
Fax (561) 989-9812